



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,983	03/05/2002	Forrest L. Pierson JR.	RIC00036	1526

25537 7590 04/23/2004

WORLDCOM, INC.
TECHNOLOGY LAW DEPARTMENT
1133 19TH STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,983

Applicant(s)

PIERSON

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ 3 sheets
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2839

Abstract not present in file (paper might be lost) it must be submitted in next response.

Spec. page 1, all SNs must be updated. New paragraph filing dates, SNs and pat nos. and docket nos. deleted is required.

Fig. 1 sockets must be shown see parent case Pat No. 6558, 190.

Note two figs. 7 submitted. Corrected formal drawings *required*.

Claims 14, 15 objected to as duplicates.

For all claims ^udisplacement ^{//} should be ^{//} insulation displacement ^{//} – to clearly state the intended limitation.

Claim 7 the ground member lacks antecedent basis.

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Terms ^{//}alternative hot conductivities ^{//} are unclear and are not explained in the spec. If such basis exists it should be pointed out by page no. and language of claims clarified.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-19, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie in view of Gaines Parsons, Zimmerman, Hoffman, Muller, Perkey, ^{Long} and Justiniano.

Brownlie discloses a box with a barrier 26 between low and high voltage sections. Justiania and Muller not essential, added to further show how such type

Art Unit: 2839

barriers at 42 and 34 would be used and Justiniano for explicit mention of high/low voltages. The Brownlie outlets 34, 36 are read as "electrical units."

The Brownlie fig. 1 cable end plug is also an electrical unit received by the box.

Brownlie uses a power socket but does disclose busbars and redundant displacement contacts. Hoffman shows a power socket (Fig. 1) with busbars 12, 14, 18 and displacement contacts 92 that redundantly (two edges) engage wires. Obvious to use such type socket in Brownlie. This provides easy connection to wires. This basis of rejection adequate for claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23.

For claim 4, obvious to use busbars that have displacement contacts and a screw holes in view of Parsons, fig. 8 at 70, 55. This provides for easy connection to wires. Claim 5 met by Hoffman blades 92. For claim 6, obvious to form contacts (fingers) 72, 64 etc to be substantially rigid. The fingers could separate slightly while being basically rigid. Such aspect is not basis to inventive concept. Claim 7, walls of part 16, form recited spacers. For claim 8, since no orientation is set forth, Hoffman cover plate 10d is readable as attached to backside of housing. In addition, while Hoffman lacks a cover plate on lower side, such features shown by Long, fig. 5 at 16 and Zimmerman at 32, fig. 3. Obvious to use these types for easy pressing onto the wires.

For claims 2, 9, 19, Brownlie/Hoffman assembly lacks two bus bar groups. Perkey fig. 1 at 34, 35, 40, shows contact groups with busbars and members (walls) 36, 37, 43, etc. obvious to use these in Brownlie, while retaining Hoffman or Long or

Art Unit: 2839

Zimmerman type displacement contacts. Also note Zimmerman redundant blades at 64, etc.

For all claims as alternative, obvious to use such type wire cutting contacts for more assured wire engagement.

Claims 11-13, 16 met as discussed above. Claim 14, 15, obvious to use Long type pusher bars 62, 66, etc. Claims 17, 18, 20-24 met as discussed above.

For all claims, should issues arise as to electrical unit limitation Brownlie/Hoffman does not disclose auxiliary electrical unit. Gaines at 6 shows such a unit. Obvious to form Brownlie, as modified to receive such a unit. This would provide illumination. Muller also noted to further show how wires would be fed to high voltage side of a wiring box.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownlie.

Obvious, even without other references that power side of divider 26 would be high voltage side and that means for connecting wires to high voltage connector 34 would be present. These are standard matters that do not appear to be at issue.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 17, 18, 21, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazzullo in view of Parsons.

Mazzullo fig. 5 discloses a box with divider 56, clean (LV) and contaminated (HV) sides. Clearly obvious that voltages on the two sides would be different. Mazzullo lacks displacement type contacts on the busbars 42, 44. It would have been obvious to form the busbars with displacement contacts of blade type in view of Parsens at 20 or like

Art Unit: 2839

those of Parsons at fig. 8. These would provide quick connection to wires. Connection to the blades could be made with tools, covers are not needed.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Justiano in view of Opel Hoffman, Long and Gaines.

Justinano discloses a box with divider 42 to separate high 50 and low 52 voltage sides. The high voltage side lacks a connector with busbars, displacement contacts, etc.

It would have been obvious to form the high voltage side 50 with or as ^a double housing like that of Opel fig. 14 with groups of busbars (inserts 16) each group being hot, neutral and ground, two hots being alternative hot conductive, an outlet 12 that would contain neutral, ground and hot busses like those of Hoffman at 12, 14, 18. This is a standard arrangement. The busses (members) in outlet 12 are read as members and would be coupled to the busbars by removable tab 74, etc (fig. 7). The busbars 60 of Opel include wire clamp screws, fig. 9. These screws are read as displacement contacts obvious to use two (redundant screws at each wire 81 connection. As an alternative also obvious to form busses 60 with insulation displacement type contacts in view of those of Hoffman at 92 or Long at 28 and to use pushers in view of Hoffman at 10d and Long at 16. This would provide quick connection to wires.

Millhimes, ^{note} ~~not~~ references to busbars".

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number (571)272-2089.

NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322

Neil Abrams